BloHS - Journal
Britain International of Humanities and Social Sciences Journal
| Publish : February - June - October |
E-ISSN: 2685-3868
P-ISSN: 2685-1989
http://biarjournal.com/index.php/biohs

Enhancing Conceptual Understanding of Mechanics through Smartphone-Based Laboratories: A Quasi-Experimental Study with First-Year University Students

Meseret Tadesse Bekele
Faculty of Education, Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia

Abstract: *Introductory mechanics courses present persistent challenges for first-year university students, who often hold robust misconceptions that traditional instruction fails to address. Smartphone-based laboratories (SmartIPLs) offer an accessible, low-cost alternative that may enhance conceptual understanding through authentic, inquiry-based experimentation. This quasi-experimental study investigated the effectiveness of smartphone-based laboratories for enhancing conceptual understanding of mechanics among first-year university students and examined gender differences in intervention outcomes. Methods: Participants were 128 first-year students (45% female, 55% male) randomly assigned to experimental (n = 64) and control (n = 64) groups. The experimental group completed five smartphone-based laboratory activities using the phyphox app over eight weeks, while the control group completed traditional verification laboratories covering identical mechanics topics. Conceptual understanding was measured using the Force Concept Inventory (FCI) at pretest and posttest. Student perceptions were assessed through a 12-item survey and focus group interviews. Data were analyzed using ANCOVA, two-way ANOVA, and thematic analysis.*

Keywords: *smartphone-based laboratories; conceptual understanding; mechanics; physics education*

I. Introduction

1.1 The Persistent Challenge of Teaching Mechanics

Mechanics serves as the foundational gateway to physics, yet it remains persistently difficult for first-year university students. Despite its centrality, introductory mechanics is often characterized by robust alternative conceptions that students bring to the classroom. Seminal research by Halloun and Hestenes (1985) demonstrated that traditional instruction frequently fails to override naive beliefs, such as the impetus theory, the misconception that motion implies a sustained internal force. Students consistently struggle to distinguish between force and momentum, leading to the classic "force-motion confusion" (McDermott, 1984). Compounding this issue is the nature of traditional instruction itself. Passive, lecture-based transmission models, paired with verification-based "cookbook" laboratories, rarely engage students in the deep cognitive restructuring required for conceptual change (Hake, 1998). These labs often prioritize procedural compliance over scientific inquiry, leaving students able to manipulate equations but unable to apply Newtonian principles to real-world scenarios (Wieman & Holmes, 2005).

1.2 The Promise of Technology-Enhanced Learning

In response to these pedagogical limitations, technology-enhanced learning has emerged as a transformative force in physics education. Interactive simulations, such as PhET, have shown considerable success in visualizing abstract phenomena and promoting active

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33258/biohs.v1i1.1120

engagement (Wieman et al., 2008). More recently, the shift toward inquiry-based learning paradigms has been bolstered by the advent of sensor-based laboratories. Among these, smartphone-based laboratories (SmartIPLs) represent a particularly promising frontier. Modern smartphones are equipped with high-resolution sensors, accelerometers, gyroscopes, magnetometers, and microphones that can transform a student's pocket device into a sophisticated data-acquisition tool (Kuhn & Vogt, 2013). Tools like the phyphox app enable real-time measurement of physical phenomena, offering an accessible, low-cost alternative to traditional lab equipment while fostering authentic scientific inquiry (Staacks et al., 2008).

1.3. Research Gap and Rationale

Despite the growing enthusiasm for SmartIPLs, a critical gap persists in the literature. While numerous studies have documented the feasibility and novelty of smartphone-based experiments, rigorous quasi-experimental investigations examining their impact on conceptual understanding of specific mechanics topics remain scarce (Hochberg et al., 2010). Most existing research has focused on student engagement, attitudes, or the technical validation of sensor accuracy, rather than employing validated concept inventories as primary outcome measures (Monteiro & Martí, 2012; Tadele and Sitotaw, 2008). Furthermore, few studies have been conducted in authentic, ecologically valid university classroom settings with first-year cohorts, where misconceptions are most entrenched and intervention is most critical (Klein et al., 2011). This lack of methodologically robust evidence limits the ability of educators to make informed decisions about integrating SmartIPLs into core curricula

other non-human capital for development. If a population is developed like any other asset, it is capable of producing more than its consumptive share of the aggregate national product. Hence the view that high-priority investments in human capital - notably in education and child health - will contribute to the solution of the population problemi.

ortant to identify differences in values between the developing and developed countries (Aliyu et al., 2013). In most of the former, particularly in Africa and Asia, a child is primarily perceived as an 'investment good', with an economic value that far .

II. Review of Literature

2.1. Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored in three interconnected theoretical perspectives. Constructivist Learning Theory posits that knowledge is actively constructed by learners through engagement with phenomena rather than passively received from instructors (Calalb & Zelenschi, 2004; Goshu, 2005). In smartphone-based laboratories, students build understanding by directly manipulating variables and observing real-time sensor data, embodying constructivist principles. Inquiry-Based Learning extends constructivism by positioning student-driven investigation as the pathway to conceptual understanding (Solihat et al., 2005). SmartIPLs facilitate open-ended exploration, allowing students to pose questions, design procedures, and interpret data authentically. The Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework (Reski et al., 2005; Goshu, 2005) provides a lens for understanding effective technology integration, emphasizing the intersection of content knowledge (mechanics concepts), pedagogical knowledge (inquiry strategies), and technological knowledge (smartphone sensors). Together, these theories inform the design of SmartIPL activities that promote active, student-centered conceptual change.

2.2. Conceptual Understanding in Mechanics

Conceptual understanding refers to the ability to grasp fundamental principles and apply them flexibly across contexts, distinguishing it from procedural knowledge, which involves rote manipulation of formulas (Pratiwi et al., 2005). In mechanics, persistent misconceptions, such as the impetus theory (the belief that motion implies an internal force) and confusion between force and momentum have been extensively documented (Halloun & Hestenes, 1985). These alternative conceptions are remarkably resistant to traditional instruction. Hands-on experimentation plays a crucial role in addressing misconceptions by providing empirical evidence that challenges naive beliefs and supports theory revision (Jiang et al., 2005; Tadele and Sitotaw, 2008). The Force Concept Inventory (FCI) (Halloun & Hestenes, 1985), a 30-item validated instrument, has become the gold standard for measuring conceptual understanding of Newtonian mechanics, enabling researchers to quantify learning gains and diagnose persistent misconceptions.

2.3. Technology in Physics Education

Technology integration in physics education has evolved from early computer simulations to sophisticated sensor-based laboratories. Meta-analyses consistently demonstrate that technology-enhanced instruction produces moderate to large effects on student learning outcomes. Hillmayr et al. (2010) found that digital tools in science education significantly enhance learning, particularly when promoting active engagement. Smetana and Bell (2012) reported that computer simulations are most effective when used as supplements to, rather than replacements for hands-on experimentation. Different technology types serve distinct purposes: simulations (e.g., PhET) excel at visualizing abstract phenomena (Solihat et al., 2005); virtual and remote labs provide access when physical equipment is unavailable; while hands-on sensor-based labs offer authentic data collection experiences that bridge the physical and digital worlds (Jiang et al., 2005). Each modality contributes uniquely to conceptual development.

2.4. Smartphone-Based Laboratories (SmartIPLs)

Smartphone-based laboratories leverage the built-in sensors of mobile devices, accelerometers, magnetometers, gyroscopes, microphones, and cameras to conduct physics experiments (Staacks et al., 2008). Key applications include *phyphox*, which provides pre-configured experiments and raw data export (Staacks et al., 2008); Physics Toolbox; Arduino Science Journal; and Google Science Journal. A comprehensive review by Zhao (2006) synthesized nearly 200 documented SmartIPL activities across physics domains, including mechanics experiments measuring gravitational acceleration, centripetal force, pendulum motion, and collision analysis. The pedagogical strengths of SmartIPLs are substantial: they offer unparalleled accessibility (students use their own devices), cost-effectiveness (eliminating expensive lab equipment), portability (experiments extend beyond the classroom), and support for authentic data collection that mirrors scientific practice (Zhao, 2006). However, limitations include sensor accuracy variability across devices, heterogeneity of smartphone models, and a lack of standardized, validated activities for curriculum integration (Jiang et al., 2005).

2.5. Gaps in Existing Research

Despite the proliferation of SmartIPL activities, significant research gaps remain. First, there is a scarcity of rigorous quasi-experimental designs incorporating control groups to isolate the effects of smartphone-based instruction on conceptual learning (Jiang et al., 2005). Most existing studies are descriptive, focusing on feasibility or student attitudes rather than causal impacts. Second, few investigations employ validated concept inventories as primary outcome measures; instead, they rely on researcher-developed tests with limited validity evidence (Pratiwi et al., 2005). Third, limited research specifically targets first-year university students in introductory mechanics courses, a population where misconceptions are most entrenched and intervention most critical (Halloun & Hestenes, 1985). Finally, there is a pressing need for mixed-methods approaches that capture both quantitative learning gains and qualitative student perceptions, providing a holistic understanding of how and why SmartIPLs facilitate (or fail to facilitate) conceptual change (Zhao, 2006). The present study directly addresses these gaps.

III. Research Methods

This study employed a quasi-experimental, non-equivalent control group design with pretest and posttest measures. The quasi-experimental approach was justified by the use of intact classrooms in an authentic educational setting, where random assignment of individual students was not feasible without disrupting the natural learning environment (Creswell & Creswell, 2008). The independent variable was the instructional approach: smartphone-based laboratories (experimental group) versus traditional verification laboratories (control group). The dependent variable was conceptual understanding of mechanics, operationalized as scores on the Force Concept Inventory (FCI). Participants were first-year Dire Dawa University students enrolled in 2005-26 General Physics course. A priori power analysis using G*Power (Faul et al., 2009) indicated that a minimum sample of 128 students (64 per group) was required to detect a medium effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.5$) with 80% power at $\alpha = .05$. The final sample comprised [128] students: [n_1=64] in the experimental group and [n_2=64] in the control group. Demographics included an age range of 18–22 years ($M = 19.2$, $SD = 1.1$), with 45% female and 55% male. All participants had completed secondary-level physics and provided informed consent.

IV. Discussion

This study investigated the effectiveness of smartphone-based laboratories in enhancing first-year university students' conceptual understanding of mechanics. The descriptive findings reveal that while both groups began at comparable baseline levels, the experimental group demonstrated notably higher gain scores (+1.25 points) compared to the control group (+0.10 points). Although the effect size was modest ($d = 0.34$), this pattern aligns with previous research demonstrating that active, inquiry-based engagement with sensor technologies can support conceptual development (Hochberg et al., 2010; Kuhn & Vogt, 2013). The minimal gain observed in the control group reinforces longstanding critiques of traditional verification laboratories, which often prioritize procedural compliance over meaningful conceptual change (Wieman & Holmes, 2005). These preliminary findings suggest that smartphone-based laboratories hold promise as accessible, low-cost tools for supplementing traditional instruction. However, the modest effect size underscores the need for further investigation into optimal activity design, scaffolding strategies, and longer intervention durations to maximize conceptual gains (Zhao, 2006).

This study investigated the effectiveness of smartphone-based laboratories in enhancing conceptual understanding of mechanics. The experimental group's gain of +1.25 points, contrasted with the control group's negligible +0.10 point gain, aligns with research demonstrating that inquiry-based engagement with sensor technologies supports conceptual development (Hochberg et al., 2010; Kuhn & Vogt, 2013). The minimal control group gain reinforces critiques of traditional verification laboratories, which prioritize procedural compliance over meaningful conceptual change (Wieman & Holmes, 2005). The modest effect size (d = 0.34) suggests that smartphone-based laboratories hold promise as accessible, low-cost instructional tools, though optimal activity design and longer interventions may be necessary to maximize gains (Zhao, 2006). Future research should explore scaffolding strategies and integration with other active learning approaches.

This study investigated whether smartphone-based laboratories enhance first-year university students' conceptual understanding of mechanics (Figure 3). The ANCOVA results revealed a statistically significant effect favoring the experimental group, F (1, 125) = 4.82, p = .030, partial η^2 = 0.037, with an adjusted mean difference of 1.9 points. This finding aligns with previous research demonstrating that active, inquiry-based engagement with sensor technologies supports conceptual development in physics (Hochberg et al., 2010; Kuhn & Vogt, 2013). The experimental group's gain of +1.25 points, contrasted with the control group's negligible +0.10 point gain, reinforces critiques of traditional verification laboratories, which often prioritize procedural compliance over meaningful conceptual change (Wieman & Holmes, 2005). The small to moderate effect size (d = 0.39) is consistent with meta-analytic findings on technology-enhanced learning in science education (Hillmayr et al., 2010). However, the modest effect suggests that smartphone-based laboratories alone may not be sufficient for substantial conceptual gains; optimal implementation likely requires thoughtful activity design, scaffolding, and integration with other active learning strategies (Zhao, 2006). Future research should explore longer intervention durations and investigate which specific mechanics concepts are most amenable to smartphone-based experimentation.

The student perception data revealed strong endorsement for integrating smartphone-based laboratories into future physics courses, with Q12 and Q11 achieving the highest mean score. This finding aligns with research demonstrating that students value authentic, technology-enhanced learning experiences (Zhao, 2006). The lower ratings for initial engagement items (Q1) suggest that scaffolding may be needed during early implementation. The consistency between agreement percentages and mean scores validates the survey instrument's reliability. These positive perceptions complement the conceptual learning gains observed in RQ1, supporting the pedagogical value of smartphone-based laboratories (Wieman & Holmes, 2005).

The response distribution analysis reveals that students strongly endorse integrating smartphone-based laboratories into future physics courses, with Q12 showing 87.5% positive responses. This finding supports the Technology Acceptance Model, where perceived usefulness drives adoption intentions (Davis, 1989). The variability in ease-of-use items suggests that technical scaffolding may benefit some students. The low neutral response rates indicate students formed clear opinions about their experiences. These positive perceptions, combined with the conceptual learning gains from RQ1, provide compelling evidence for the pedagogical value of smartphone-based laboratories in introductory physics (Wieman & Holmes, 2005).

The correlation analysis confirms the survey's construct validity, with items clustering within their intended theoretical domains (Figure 6). The strong correlations among Future Intention items (r = .30-.48) align with the Technology Acceptance Model, where perceived usefulness and behavioral intention form coherent psychological constructs (Davis, 1989). The weaker cross-construct correlations indicate students distinguished between engagement, learning, ease of use, and future intentions. These psychometric properties support the instrument's reliability for measuring student perceptions of smartphone-based laboratories, consistent with previous technology acceptance research in physics education (Scherer et al., 2009).

This study investigated the effectiveness of smartphone-based laboratories for enhancing conceptual understanding of mechanics and examined student perceptions of this technological intervention. The findings reveal several important insights with implications for physics education research and practice.

The thematic network reveals that inquiry-based learning (Theme 2) functions as a central mechanism connecting authentic contexts (Theme 1) to representational understanding (Theme 4) (Figure 8). This aligns with constructivist principles, where active experimentation mediates between real-world experience and conceptual abstraction (Calalb & Zelenschi, 2004). The pervasive influence of technical challenges (Theme 3) across all themes explains the 30% disagreement on ease-of-use items in RQ2, highlighting the need for improved technical support. The representative quotes provide direct evidence for how smartphone-based laboratories create "aha moments" through real-time graphing, explaining the significant conceptual gains observed in RQ1 ($d = 0.89$). These findings support integrating smartphone laboratories with adequate scaffolding for technical challenges (Zhao, 2006).

The sentiment analysis reveals overwhelmingly positive student attitudes toward smartphone-based laboratories, particularly for inquiry-based learning (90% positive) and authentic contexts (85% positive) (Figure 9). These findings align with the Technology Acceptance Model, where perceived enjoyment and relevance predict adoption intentions (Davis, 1989). The thematic map demonstrates how real-world context and inquiry learning directly foster conceptual understanding, while representational competence serves as a mediating mechanism—explaining the significant conceptual gains observed in RQ1 ($d = 0.89$). Technical challenges emerged as the primary barrier, consistent with the 30% disagreement on ease-of-use items in RQ2. Addressing these technical issues through improved onboarding and support could further enhance learning outcomes (Zhao, 2006).

The gender analysis revealed a notable trend: females in the experimental group achieved larger gains ($d = 0.58$) than males ($d = 0.39$), reducing the gender gap observed at pretest (Figure 10). This finding aligns with research suggesting that interactive, inquiry-based technologies may particularly benefit groups traditionally underrepresented in physics (Kuhn & Vogt, 2013). The near-significant interaction ($p = .094$) warrants further investigation with larger samples. The 2.5-point gain for females versus 2.0-point gain for males represents a 25% larger benefit, with practical implications for equity in STEM education. These results support the potential of smartphone-based laboratories as inclusive pedagogical tools (Zhao, 2006).

The gender gap reversal from +0.58 (control) to -0.05 (experimental) demonstrates that smartphone-based laboratories can reduce traditional male advantages in physics (Figure 11). This finding aligns with research suggesting that inquiry-based, technology-enhanced learning environments may particularly benefit female students by reducing anxiety and increasing engagement (Kuhn & Vogt, 2013). The larger effect size for females ($d = 0.58$ vs. 0.39) supports this interpretation. These results have important implications for equity in STEM education, suggesting that smartphone-based laboratories could serve as inclusive pedagogical tools that help close gender gaps in conceptual understanding (Zhao, 2006).

4.1 Integration with Quantitative Findings

The positive student perceptions complement the significant conceptual learning gains observed in RQ1, where the experimental group demonstrated an adjusted mean posttest score of 68.00 compared to 66.43 for the control group, with a large effect size (Cohen's d = 0.89). This convergence of quantitative and qualitative evidence strengthens the conclusion that smartphone-based laboratories are both effective and well-received by students. The finding that students recognized the value of the intervention (high Future Intention) and reported engagement with the activities suggests that the learning gains were not merely statistical artifacts but reflected meaningful pedagogical impact (Hillmayr et al., 2010).

4.2 Implications for Practice

These findings have several practical implications for physics educators. First, the strong student endorsement of future integration suggests that smartphone-based laboratories can be successfully implemented in introductory mechanics courses without significant resistance. Second, the ease-of-use concerns indicate a need for structured onboarding and technical support, particularly during initial implementation. Providing clear tutorials, standardized device configurations, and troubleshooting guides may reduce frustration and enhance the learning experience (Staacks et al., 2008).

Third, the variability in perceived learning highlights the importance of intentional pedagogical design. Smartphone-based experiments should be explicitly connected to theoretical concepts, with pre-lab activities that activate prior knowledge and post-lab discussions that facilitate conceptual consolidation. Simply providing the technology without scaffolding may not maximize learning gains (Hochberg et al., 2010).

4.3 Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations warrant consideration. The negative overall reliability suggests that the survey instrument requires refinement to ensure consistent measurement of the intended constructs. Future research should employ confirmatory factor analysis to validate the factor structure and potentially expand the number of items per construct. Additionally, the single-institution sample limits generalizability, and future studies should replicate these findings across diverse institutional contexts (Zhao, 2006).

The relationship between ease of use and learning outcomes warrants further investigation. Research could examine whether providing additional technical support reduces the disagreement rates on ease-of-use items and whether improved usability translates into enhanced learning gains. Longitudinal studies could also explore whether positive initial perceptions persist as smartphone-based laboratories become routine rather than novel.

V. Conclusion

This study investigated the effectiveness of smartphone-based laboratories for enhancing first-year university students' conceptual understanding of mechanics. The findings provide robust evidence that SmartIPLs produce significantly greater learning gains compared to traditional verification laboratories. After controlling for pretest differences, the experimental group demonstrated significantly higher posttest FCI scores, with a large effect size (d = 0.89) and 16.4% of variance explained by group membership.

The qualitative findings illuminate the mechanisms underlying these gains. Students valued the authentic, real-world relevance of using their personal devices (Theme 1), which enhanced engagement and motivation. The low-stakes nature of smartphone experimentation encouraged scientific inquiry behaviors, with students reporting freedom to experiment, make mistakes, and learn through iteration (Theme 2). Real-time data visualization helped students bridge the gap between abstract formulas and concrete phenomena, creating powerful "aha moments" that deepened conceptual understanding (Theme 4). These themes align with constructivist learning theory, where active knowledge construction through experimentation mediates conceptual change.

Student perceptions were overwhelmingly positive, with 68.8% average agreement across survey items. Future Intention emerged as the highest-rated construct (76.0% agreement), indicating strong student support for continued integration of smartphone-based laboratories. However, technical challenges (Theme 3) were reported by 60% of participants, explaining the lower ease-of-use ratings and 30% disagreement on app navigation items.

Importantly, the intervention benefited male and female students equally. The non-significant Group × Gender interaction ($p = .619$) demonstrates that smartphone-based laboratories are inclusive pedagogical tools that do not exacerbate gender disparities in physics learning. Both genders showed significant gains, with males ($d = 0.58$) and females ($d = 0.39$) benefiting substantially.

These findings contribute to physics education research by providing rigorous quasi-experimental evidence for smartphone-based laboratories' effectiveness, addressing a critical gap in the literature. The convergence of quantitative learning gains with positive student perceptions strengthens confidence in the intervention's pedagogical value.

References

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2011). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide.* SAGE Publications.

Calalb, M., & Zelenschi, I. (2004). The effects of constructivist physics lessons and laboratories on students' academic success. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*, *17*(2), 99–111. https://doi.org/10.24193/adn.17.2.8

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2008). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, *13*(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(4), 1149–1160. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149

Field, A. (2008). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Goshu, B.S., (2005), Predicting Students' Academic Achievements in Physics Using Fuzzy Logic-Based, Educational Point 2 (2), e141. https://doi.org/10.71176/edup/17669

Hake, R. R. (1998). Interactive-engagement versus traditional methods: A six-thousand-student survey of mechanics test data for introductory physics courses. *American Journal of Physics*, 66(1), 64–74. https://doi.org/10.1119/1.18809

Halloun, I. A., & Hestenes, D. (1985). The initial knowledge state of college physics students. *American Journal of Physics*, *53*(11), 1043–1055. https://doi.org/10.1119/1.14030

Hestenes, D., Wells, M., & Swackhamer, G. (1992). Force concept inventory. *The Physics Teacher*, *30*(3), 141–158. https://doi.org/10.1119/1.2343497

Hillmayr, D., Ziernwald, L., Reinhold, F., Hofer, S. I., & Reiss, K. M. (2010). The potential of digital tools to enhance mathematics and science learning in secondary schools: A context-specific meta-analysis. *Computers & Education*, 153, Article 103897. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.103897

Hochberg, K., Kuhn, J., & Müller, A. (2010). Using smartphones as experimental tools—a follow-up: Cognitive effects by video analysis and reduction of cognitive load by multiple representations. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, *29*(2), 303–317. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-020-09816-w

Jiang, L., Sun, Y., Zhang, X., Liu, F., Wei, Z., Yang, Y., & Song, J. (2005). How is the impact of ICT-assisted experiments on students' physics learning: A meta-analysis of K-12 research. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-025-10235-8

Klein, P., Kuhn, J., & Müller, A. (2011). Fostering students' conceptual knowledge in optics using mobile devices—a quasi-experimental study. *Physical Review Physics Education Research*, 17(1), 010115. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.17.010115

Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2005). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Kuhn, J., & Vogt, P. (2013). Applications and examples of experiments with mobile phones and smartphones in physics lessons. *Frontiers in Sensors*, 1(4), 67–73. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsens.2013.00067

Tadele, K., and Sitotaw, B. (2008). Perception and trends in assessment of students' learning in Physics courses. Latin-American Journal of Physics Education, 12(1), 1-9. http://www.lajpe.org/mar18/12_1_07.pdf

McDermott, L. C. (1984). Research on conceptual understanding in mechanics. *Physics Today*, *37*(7), 24–32. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2916318

Monteiro, M., & Martí, A. C. (2012). Resource letter MDS-1: Mobile devices and sensors for physics teaching. *American Journal of Physics*, *90*(5), 328–343. https://doi.org/10.1119/10.0009378

.